



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/222,833	12/30/1998	TADASHI OHASHI	1341.1025/JD	2628

21171 7590 04/10/2003

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
700 11TH STREET, NW  
SUITE 500  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003

20

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/222,833

Applicant(s)

OHASHI, TADASHI

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 12/30/03 to the application filed on 12/30/98.
2. Claims 1-9 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7-9 are independent claims.
3. The rejections of claims 1, 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
4. The rejections of claims 2-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson and further in view of Domen have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

***Priority***

5. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1,7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (US Pat No. 5,553,289, 9/3/96) in view of Nielsen (US Pat No. 6,405,243 B1, 6/11/02, filed 4/5/96).

- storing said documents (figure 1, #7; col 2, lines 51-61, storage device where to store documents)
- acquiring information from a device connected to the communication network (figure 1, information can be retrieved from a plurality of computers connected to the communication network)
- determining, for each document stored in the document storage section by reading out the master attribute information maintained by said information management device through said communication section, whether the attribute information included in the document conflicts with the master attribute information (figure 4, #63-72; col 4, lines 32-60, detect and resolve the conflict)

Johnson does not disclose rewriting any of the attribute information included in the document when said determination section determined that the attribute information conflicts with the master attribute information.

Instead Johnson discloses that the conflict, if found, is resolved by user and by assigning associated attributes for distribution, in accordance with the table (figure 4, #63-72; col 4, lines 32-60).

Johnson also does not disclose that determining whether the attribute information included in the document conflicts with the master attribute information is for to manage the distribution targets of the documents.

Art Unit: 2178

Nielsen discloses updating the recipient's email address after receiving message regarding recipient's new email address and searching in the email address database to find the old address of the recipient (col 4, line 60 to col 6, line 10; figure 3; col 2, line 56 to col 3, line 4). Nielsen further discloses updating the sender's address book with the recipient's new mail address (col 7, lines 15-35; figure 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Nielsen into Johnson since the *email sending* in Nielsen is a form of *document distribution*, the email address is considered as the attribute information of the email document, and the recipient is considered as a distribution target. The checking of email address in Nielsen to see if there is an old email address corresponding to the new email address of a user inherently shows determining a conflict between the email address stored in the database of the server and the current address of a user, where the current address is the new address of the user. In addition, updating the email address, which is rewriting the old email address into the new email address, shows rewriting the attribute information for the distribution target. Furthermore, resolving the conflict and assigning associated attributes for distribution in accordance to the table in Johnson obviously show determining the conflict and rewriting the attribute information for distribution target into a proper form.

Independent claim 7 is for a computer-readable medium for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

Independent claim 8 is for a computer system for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 9 is for a system for managing electronic documents of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

8. Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Nielsen as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Domen et al. (US Pat No. 5,504,676, 4/2/96, filed 5/26/94).

Regarding to claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Johnson and Nielsen do not disclose:

- each document comprises corporate organization codes as well as corporate organization names as attribute information used to manage distribution targets of each document
- the attribute information included in a document conflicts with the master attribute information in a case where the corporate organization codes included in said document are stored in the master attribute information but a combination of the corporate organization codes with the corporate organization names is not stored therein, and also in the case where the corporate organization names included in said document are stored in the master attribute information but the combination of the corporate organization codes with the corporate organization names is not stored therein

Art Unit: 2178

- rewriting corporate organization names and rewriting corporate organization codes in said document when the above conflicts are determined

Domen discloses:

- said document is a document including the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name (col 6, lines 15-27, 29-34, 45-50; col 7, lines 62-67; col 8, lines 5-11, the ordering slip includes the department name and the department code)
- updating of the format and data once per several times of use (col 1, lines 7-14, 26-34; col 2, lines 15-21)

Domen does not explicitly disclose the cases of conflict when an organization code is included in a document but the combination of the organization code and the organization name is not included in the master information, or when the organization name is included in a document but the combination of the organization code and the organization name is not included in the master information.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Domen into Johnson and Nielsen because of the following reason. Domen provides the data of a document including *the department name and the department code for the document distribution and updating the format and data*. Johnson provides an *attribute assignment for distribution* if a conflict between the document attribute and the attributes in the table is detected. The combination of Domen into Johnson and Nielsen would provide the ability to rewrite data and attribute

information for distribution when the conflict between the master attributes and the document attribute about the department code and the department name is found.

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Johnson discloses assigning attributes for distribution a document when a conflict between the document attribute and the attributes in the table is found (figure 4 #63-72; col 4, lines 31-61). Nielsen discloses the conflict of the old email address and the new email address (figure 4; col 5, line 60 to col 6, line 55)

Johnson and Nielsen do not disclose:

- maintaining *second master attribute information*, in which a corporate organization code or a corporate organization name can be retrieved using job information, is connected to the communication network
- retrieving a corporate organization code or a corporate organization name correlated to job information of the document from the second master attribute information
- rewriting contents of said document, when a combination of the corporate organization code with the corporate organization name retrieved does not coincide with the combination of the corporate organization code with the corporate organization name included in the document

Domen discloses:

- retrieving of the department name and the department code corresponding to each ordering slip (col 6, lines 29-50, the department name and the corresponding



department code are displayed, this implies the department name and the department code are retrieved for displaying)

- updating of the format and data once per several times of use (col 1, lines 7-14, 26-34; col 2, lines 15-21)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Domen and Johnson and Nielsen to include the second master attribute information for storing the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name, which are attribute information of a document, and to include rewriting the content of said document, when a combination of the corporate organization code with the corporate organization name retrieved does not coincide with the combination of the corporate organization code with the corporate organization name included in the document. As mentioned in claim 1 above, Johnson allows assigning attributes if the *conflict of values or attributes of an item for distribution is detected* and Nielsen provides updating the email address into the new email address. Therefore, the case when the combination of the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name retrieved from the master attributes does not coincide with the combination of the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name included in the document, can be the case when the conflict is found between the attributes in the table and the *destination attribute* associated with the document. This also can be the case when the current address of the recipient, which is the target in document distribution, has the conflict with the recipient's address stored previously in the server database.

Regarding claims 4-6, which are dependent on claims 1-3 respectively, Johnson and Nielsen do not disclose outputting an electronic mail, when the document is rewritten, to notify changing of an attribute information in the document to each department identified by the attribute information included in the rewritten document.

Domen discloses using an electronic email to notify things to other work station (col 2, lines 31-34, command is issued from a terminal ... the prepared form may be transmitted to other work station by an electronic mail).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Domen to include the notification of changing of attribute information in the document to each department since using of electronic email to notify things to other workstation motivates the notification of the changing of attribute information to each department through the communication network via department addresses. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Domen into Johnson and Nielsen to provide a notification of changing attribute information to the party who needs such information when a data change is found in addition to rewriting data when the conflict is found.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants argue that the attribute for distribution in Johnson is not the distribution target attribute since the Johnson attribute is for the types of the emails such as confidential or urgent, not the “who or what” that receives the email.

Examiner agrees.

Nielsen, in combination with Johnson, discloses the recipient’s email address, which is the attribute of the email, where the recipient can be the “who or what” that receives the distributed email, and discloses updating the email address to rewrite the attribute information of an email document when there is an address change (col 4, line 60 to col 6, line 10; figure 3; col 2, line 56 to col 3, line 4; col 7, lines 15-35; figure 5).

### ***Conclusion***

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2178

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Koda et al. (US Pat No. 5,749,083, 5/5/98, 1/19/93).

Bunnell (US Pat No. 6,119,122, 9/12/00, 9/17/97).


Nakagawa et al. (US Pat No. 5,819,295, 10/6/98, 9/26/96).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 707-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9000.

clh  
April 3, 2003

  
HEATHER R. HERNDON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100